

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated Office Action dated September 30, 2009, claims 64, 80, 95 and 109 have been amended. Claims 64-109 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 64-71, 77, 80-87, 93, 95-101 and 107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth in view of Armbruster and in further view of Bull.

In paragraph 5 on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 72-75, 79, 88-91 and 102-105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth in view of Armbruster and Bull, and in further view of Sheena.

In paragraph 6 on page 9 of the Office Action, claims 76, 92 and 106 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth in view of Armbruster and Bull, and in further view of Eldering.

In paragraph 7 on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 78, 94 and 108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth in view of Armbruster and Bull, and in further view of Park.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution has amended the claims.

Independent claim 64 sets forth a method that includes monitoring packets at an Internet Service Provider (ISP) point of presence (POP), identifying monitored packets associated with Web page requests, anonymously capturing, at the Internet Service Provider (ISP) point of presence (POP), packets identified as being associated with Web page requests, extracting, at the ISP POP, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the

requested Web page and an IP address of the packets identified as being associated with the Web page request, processing the extracted IP address to correlate the extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP, associating each extracted URL with the client correlated with the extracted IP address, determining a user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address, for each client correlated with the extracted IP address, storing the URL of the requested Web page and the user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address, developing a user profile for the user ID, at the ISP POP, based on the extracted URLs associated with Web pages requested by the client having the user IDs and cross referencing Web site profiles with the extracted URLs associated with Web pages requested by the client having the user ID to generate an updated user profile, at the ISP POP, based on inferred user demographics of the Web sites requested by the client having the user ID. Independent claims 80, 95 and 109 set forth similar elements.

Roth discloses a system that provides advertisements from a central server in response to a user accessing a web site having an HTML reference to an advertising server. Roth states that the server system uses the information from cookie to update the data base of viewer information to reflect the fact that this particular viewer has accessed this particular web page. According to Roth, a viewer always accesses the Internet using the same browser, so that the cookie in a browser accurately reflects what a viewer has done. Roth also states that only one viewer uses a particular browser, again so that the cookie in the browser accurately reflects what the particular viewer has done. However, the operations all occur over the Internet, i.e., after the user data has been transmitted through the ISP POP to the Internet.

Roth, therefore, fails to disclose anonymously capturing, at the ISP POP, packets identified as being associated with Web page requests.

Roth also fails to disclose extracting, at the ISP POP, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the requested Web page and an IP address of the packets identified as being associated with the Web page request. Roth does extract the URL of a requested Web page, but does not suggest extracting an IP address from the packets.

Roth further fails to suggest processing the extracted IP address to correlate the extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP. Roth fails to mention correlating an extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP.

Roth also fails to disclose determining a user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address. Rather, Roth states that a viewer always accesses the Internet using the same browser, so that the cookie in a browser accurately reflects what a viewer has done. Roth also states that only one viewer uses a particular browser. Roth simply fails to suggest any type of correlation.

Roth also fails to disclose storing the URL of the requested Web page and the user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address. Roth does not process the packets to identify a user ID using a cross-reference table for correlation with anonymous user IDs. Other than through the use of cookies, Roth fails to suggest any way of identifying a user.

Roth fails to suggest developing a user profile for the user ID, at the ISP POP, based on the extracted URLs associated with Web pages requested by the client having the user IDs. Again, Roth merely discloses using cookies to gather information about a viewer.

However, if a viewer is surfing anonymously, Roth cannot develop a user profile because Roth has no way of identifying the viewer.

Thus, Roth fails to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in new independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Armbruster fails to overcome the deficiencies of Roth. Armbruster is merely cited as disclosing a system that maintains certain cacheable data at a local cache at an ISP of a user or at a central caching server.

However, Armbruster is completely silent regarding performing any of the above functions at an ISP POP. Moreover, Armbruster fails to disclose, teach or suggest anonymously capturing, at the ISP POP, packets identified as being associated with Web page requests. Rather, Armbruster only discloses modifying URLs of cached data so that requests for such data are directed to the local cache or to the central caching server. However, Armbruster does not mention capturing packets associated with Web page requests anonymously.

Armbruster also fails to suggest extracting, at the ISP POP, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the requested Web page and an IP address of the packets identified as being associated with the Web page request. Armbruster does disclose obtaining an IP address of a requested URL. However, Armbruster does not even mention extracting IP addresses of a client requesting a Web page.

Armbruster also fails to suggest processing the extracted IP address to correlate the extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP. Armbruster fails to mention correlating an extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP.

Armbruster also fails to suggest determining a user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address. Rather, Armbruster does not even mention user IDs. Instead, Armbruster is merely concerned with being able to route a user to a central cache for data that is not maintained or available in a local cache.

Armbruster also fails to suggest developing a user profile for the user ID, at the ISP POP, based on the extracted URLs associated with Web pages requested by the client having the user IDs. Again, Armbruster merely discloses routing a user to a central cache for data that is not maintained or available in a local cache.

Thus, Roth and Armbruster, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Bull fails to overcome the deficiencies of Roth and Armbruster. Bull is merely cited as disclosing that the user's web viewing patterns are monitored and matched against software text agents to match a profile including user demographics. According to Bull, during a session or after a user discontinues use, the data viewed (recorded in the browsing activity datastore 240) is analyzed by the session profile update 2921 and the user profile datastore 210 is updated with keywords or personal search text agent datastore 232.

Accordingly, Bull merely creates a profile based on a user's viewing patterns. Bull fails to disclose extracting an IP address of the packets identified as being associated with the Web page request. Bull further fails to suggest processing the extracted IP address to correlate the extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP. Rather, Bull develops a user profile based on data entered by the user and/or the viewing patterns of the user. Nevertheless, Bull fails to mention correlating an extracted IP address with a client using a cross-reference table at the ISP POP.

Bull also fails to disclose determining a user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address. Bull also fails to disclose storing the user ID associated with the client correlated with the extracted IP address. Bull does not process the packets to identify a user ID using a cross-reference table for correlation with anonymous user IDs.

Bull further fails to suggest developing a user profile for the user ID based on the extracted URLs associated with Web pages requested by the client having the user IDs. Rather, Bull discloses that the user's viewing patterns may only be monitored if the user logs on to the system.

Bull further fails to disclose storing each URL associated with a Web site requested by a client and the user ID of that client. Again, Bull merely discloses that a user logs on to the system and, therefore, Bull fails to disclose determining the user ID of the client.

Thus, Roth, Armbruster and Bull, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in new independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Sheena fails to overcome the deficiencies of Roth, Armbruster and Bull. Sheena is merely cited as disclosing the use of an averaging algorithm to calculate a similarity factor between a pair of users. According to Sheena, the similarity between a pair of users may be calculated by averaging the squared difference between their ratings for mutually rated items. Thus, the similarity factor between user x and user y is calculated by subtracting, for each item rated by both users, the rating given to an item by user y from the rating given to that same item by user x and squaring the difference. The squared differences are summed and divided by the total number of items rated.

However, Sheena does not disclose the above-described functions occurring at an Internet Service Provider (ISP) point of presence (POP). Sheena also does not disclose

capturing packets associated with Web page requests anonymously. Sheena does not disclose determining a user ID associated with each IP address of a client requesting a Web page. Sheena still further fails to suggest cross referencing Web site profiles with the extracted URLs to generate an updated user profile based on inferred user demographics of the Web sites requested by the client having the user ID. Sheena simply does not disclose such cross-referencing.

Thus, Roth, Armbruster, Bull and Sheena, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in new independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Eldering fails to overcome the deficiencies of Roth, Armbruster, Bull and Sheena. Eldering is merely cited as disclosing the generation of a profile based on the purchase history of a consumer. To preserve privacy, Eldering discloses the records of Web sites a user has visited are erased after developing the user's profile. More specifically, Eldering discloses maintaining consumer privacy via private data networks.

However, Eldering does not disclose the above-described functions occurring at an Internet Service Provider (ISP) point of presence (POP). Eldering also does not disclose capturing packets associated with Web page requests anonymously.

Eldering does not disclose determining a user ID associated with each extracted IP address of a client requesting a Web page. Eldering further fails to disclose storing the user ID of that client. Eldering still further fails to suggest cross referencing Web site profiles with the extracted URLs to generate an updated user profile based on inferred user demographics of the Web sites requested by the client having the user ID. Eldering simply does not disclose such cross-referencing.

Thus, Roth, Armbruster, Bull, Sheena and Eldering, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in new independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Park fails to overcome the deficiencies of Roth, Armbruster, Bull, Sheena and Eldering. Park is merely cited as disclosing the transmitting of pop-up and banner advertisements to a display of a computer operated by the user.

However, Park does not disclose the above-described functions occurring at an Internet Service Provider (ISP) point of presence (POP). Park also does not disclose capturing packets associated with Web page requests anonymously. Park does not disclose determining a user ID associated with each extracted IP address of a client requesting a Web page.

Thus, Roth, Armbruster, Bull, Sheena, Eldering and Park, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in new independent claims 64, 80, 95 and 109.

Dependent claims 65-79, 81-94 and 96-108 are also patentable over the references, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 64, 80 and 95, respectively. Further dependent claims 65-79, 81-94 and 96-108 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 65-79, 81-94 and 96-108 are patentable over the cited references.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 865-380-5976. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725 for any additional fee required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(865) 380-5976
Date: December 23, 2009



By:

Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE